

CLASSIFICATION OF FINITELY GENERATED LATTICE-ORDERED ABELIAN GROUPS WITH ORDER-UNIT

MANUELA BUSANICHE [‡], LEONARDO CABRER [‡], AND DANIELE MUNDICI[†]

ABSTRACT. A unital ℓ -group (G, u) is an abelian group G equipped with a translation-invariant lattice-order and a distinguished element u , called order-unit, whose positive integer multiples eventually dominate each element of G . We classify finitely generated unital ℓ -groups by sequences $\mathcal{W} = (W_0, W_1, \dots)$ of weighted abstract simplicial complexes, where W_{i+1} is obtained from W_i either by the classical Alexander binary stellar operation, or by deleting a maximal simplex of W_i . A simple criterion is given to recognize when two such sequences classify isomorphic unital ℓ -groups. Many properties of the unital ℓ -group (G, u) can be directly read off from its associated sequence: for instance, the properties of being totally ordered, archimedean, finitely presented, simplicial, free.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with abelian groups G equipped with a translation-invariant lattice-order and a distinguished *order-unit* u , i.e., an element whose positive integer multiples eventually dominate each element of G . For brevity, (G, u) will be said to be a *unital ℓ -group*. We refer to [3, 10] for background.

We will classify every finitely generated unital ℓ -group by a sequence $\mathcal{W}$ of weighted abstract simplicial complexes. A main reason of interest in this classification is that Elliott classification [11] yields a one-one correspondence κ between isomorphism classes of unital AF C^* -algebras whose Murray-von Neumann order of projections is a lattice, and isomorphism classes of countable unital ℓ -groups: κ is an order-theoretic enrichment of Grothendieck K_0 functor, [14, 3.9, 3.12]. Thus our Theorem 6.1 can be turned into a simple criterion to recognize when two sequences $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}'$ determine isomorphic AF C^* -algebras $A_{\mathcal{W}}$ and $A_{\mathcal{W}'}$. This criterion is reminiscent of the equivalence criterion for Bratteli diagrams, [5, 2.7]—but our sequences are much simpler combinatorial objects than Bratteli diagrams.

Another application of this classification immediately follows from the categorical equivalence Γ between unital ℓ -groups and MV-algebras, the algebraic counterparts of Łukasiewicz infinite-valued logic, [14, 3.9]. Our sequences provide a combinatorial classification of the Lindenbaum algebras of all theories in Łukasiewicz infinite-valued logic with finitely many variables.

To describe our classifier, let us recall that a *(finite) abstract simplicial complex* is a pair $H = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma)$ where $\mathcal{V}$ is a finite nonempty set, whose elements are called

Date: August 18, 2009.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 06F20, 52B11 Secondary: 52B20, 57Q15, 46L05.

Key words and phrases. Lattice-ordered abelian group, rational polyhedron, order-unit, simplicial complex, abstract simplicial complex, stellar subdivision, Alexander starring, regular fan, De Concini-Procesi theorem, piecewise linear function, Elliott classification, AF C^* -algebra.

the *vertices* of H , and Σ is a collection of subsets of $\mathcal{V}$ whose union is $\mathcal{V}$, and with the property that every subset of an element of Σ is again an element of Σ . As a particular case of a construction of Alexander [1, p. 298], given a two-element set $\{v, w\} \in \Sigma$ and $a \notin \mathcal{V}$ we define the *binary subdivision* $(\{v, w\}, a)$ of H as the abstract simplicial complex $(\{v, w\}, a)H$ obtained by adding a to the vertex set, and replacing every set $\{v, w, u_1, \dots, u_t\} \in \Sigma$ by the two sets $\{v, a, u_1, \dots, u_t\}$ and $\{a, w, u_1, \dots, u_t\}$ and their faces.

A *weighted abstract simplicial complex* is a triple $W = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$ where $(\mathcal{V}, \Sigma)$ is an abstract simplicial complex and ω is a map of $\mathcal{V}$ into the set $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. For $\{v, w\} \in \Sigma$ and $a \notin \mathcal{V}$, the *binary subdivision* $(\{v, w\}, a)W$ is the abstract simplicial complex $(\{v, w\}, a)(\mathcal{V}, \Sigma)$ equipped with the weight function $\tilde{\omega}: \mathcal{V} \cup \{a\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ given by $\tilde{\omega}(a) = \omega(v) + \omega(w)$ and $\tilde{\omega}(u) = \omega(u)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{V}$.

A sequence $\mathcal{W} = (W_0, W_1, \dots)$ of weighted abstract simplicial complexes is *stellar* if W_{j+1} is obtained from W_j either by a deletion of a maximal set in W_j , or by a binary subdivision, or else $W_{j+1} = W_j$.

We will construct a map $\mathcal{W} \mapsto \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ assigning to each stellar sequence a unital ℓ -group, and in Theorem 5.1 we prove that, up to isomorphism, all finitely generated unital ℓ -groups arise as $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ for some $\mathcal{W}$. In Theorems 6.1 and 6.3 we give necessary and sufficient conditions for two stellar sequences to determine isomorphic unital ℓ -groups. In Theorem 7.1 we will describe the combinatorial counterparts of such ℓ -group properties as semisimplicity, simplicity, freeness, finite presentability, and the property of being totally ordered.

Throughout this paper we will use techniques from polyhedral geometry, notably regular fans and their desingularizations, [9]. Our key tool is given by $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphisms (i.e., PL-homeomorphisms with integer coefficients). In Theorem 3.1 it is proved that $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphisms are the geometrical counterpart of unital ℓ -isomorphisms. All the necessary background material will be provided in the next section.

2. UNITAL ℓ -GROUPS, POLYHEDRA AND REGULAR COMPLEXES

Lattice-ordered abelian groups with order-unit. A *lattice-ordered abelian group* (ℓ -group) is a structure $(G, +, -, 0, \vee, \wedge)$ such that $(G, +, -, 0)$ is an abelian group, $(G, \vee, \wedge)$ is a lattice, and $x + (y \vee z) = (x + y) \vee (x + z)$ for all $x, y, z \in G$. An *order-unit* in G (“*unité forte*” in [3]) is an element $u \in G$ having the property that for every $g \in G$ there is $0 \leq n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $g \leq nu$. A *unital ℓ -group* (G, u) is an ℓ -group G with a distinguished order-unit u .

The morphisms of unital ℓ -groups, called *unital ℓ -homomorphisms*, are group-homomorphisms that also preserve the order-unit and the lattice structure. By an *ℓ -ideal* I of (G, u) we mean the kernel of a unital ℓ -homomorphism. Any such I determines the (quotient) unital ℓ -homomorphism $(G, u) \rightarrow (G, u)/I$ in the usual way [3, 10].

We let $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ denote the unital ℓ -group of piecewise linear continuous functions $f: [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that each piece of f has integer coefficients, with the constant function 1 as a distinguished order-unit. The number of pieces is always finite; “linear” is to be understood in the affine sense.

More generally, for any nonempty subset $X \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ we denote by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ the unital ℓ -group of restrictions to X of the functions in $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$, with the constant function 1 as the order-unit.

For every ℓ -ideal I of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ we denote by $\mathcal{Z}(I)$ the family of zerosets of (the functions in) I , in symbols,

$$\mathcal{Z}(I) = \{X \subseteq [0, 1]^n \mid \exists g \in I \text{ with } X = \mathcal{Z}(g) = g^{-1}(0)\}. \quad (1)$$

The coordinate functions $\pi_i: [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, ($i = 1, \dots, n$), together with the unit 1, generate the unital ℓ -group $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$. They are said to be a *free generating set* of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ because they have the following universal property:

Theorem 2.1. [14, 4.16] *Let $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\} \subseteq [0, u]$ be a set of generators of a unital ℓ -group (G, u) . Then the map $\pi_i \mapsto g_i$ can be uniquely extended to a unital ℓ -homomorphism of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ onto (G, u) .*

Corollary 2.2. *Up to ℓ -isomorphism, every finitely generated unital ℓ -group has the form $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)/I$ for some n and ℓ -ideal I of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$.*

Rational polyhedra, complexes and regularity. Following [17, p.4], by a *polyhedron* $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ we mean a finite union of convex hulls of finite sets of points in $\mathbb{R}^n$. A *rational polyhedron* is a finite union of convex hulls of finite sets of rational points in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. An example of rational polyhedron $P \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ is given by the zeroset $\mathcal{Z}(f) = f^{-1}(0)$ of any $f \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$. In Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 below we will see that this is the most general possible example.

For any rational point $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by $\text{den}(y)$ the least common denominator of the coordinates of y . The integer vector $\tilde{y} = \text{den}(y)(y, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ is called the *homogeneous correspondent* of y . For every rational m -simplex $T = \text{conv}(v_0, \dots, v_m) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we will use the notation

$$T^\uparrow = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \tilde{v}_0 + \dots + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \tilde{v}_m$$

for the positive span of $\tilde{v}_0, \dots, \tilde{v}_m$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

We refer to [9] for background on simplicial complexes. Unless otherwise specified, every complex $\mathcal{K}$ in this paper will be simplicial, and the adjective “simplicial” will be mostly omitted. For every complex $\mathcal{K}$, its *support* $|\mathcal{K}|$ is the pointset union of all simplexes of $\mathcal{K}$. We say that the complex $\mathcal{K}$ is *rational* if all simplexes of $\mathcal{K}$ are rational: in this case, the set

$$\mathcal{K}^\uparrow = \{T^\uparrow \mid T \in \mathcal{K}\}$$

is known as a simplicial fan [9].

A rational m -simplex $T = \text{conv}(v_0, \dots, v_m) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is *regular* if the set $\{\tilde{v}_0, \dots, \tilde{v}_m\}$ is part of a basis in the free abelian group $\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$. A rational complex Δ is said to be *regular* if every simplex $T \in \Delta$ is regular. In other words, the fan $\Delta^\uparrow$ is regular [9, V, §4].

We recall here some results about regular complexes and rational polyhedra for later use. For detailed proofs see [13] and [16] where regular complexes are called “unimodular triangulations”.

Proposition 2.3. [13, 5.1] *A set $X \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ coincides with the support of some regular complex Δ iff $X = f^{-1}(0)$ for some $f \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$.*

Lemma 2.4. [16, p.539] *Any rational polyhedron $P \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ is the support of some regular complex Δ .*

Subdivision, blow-up, Farey mediant. Given complexes $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ with $|\mathcal{K}| = |\mathcal{H}|$ we say that $\mathcal{H}$ is a *subdivision* of $\mathcal{K}$ if every simplex of $\mathcal{H}$ is contained in a simplex of $\mathcal{K}$. For any point $p \in |\mathcal{K}| \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, the *blow-up* $\mathcal{K}_{(p)}$ of $\mathcal{K}$ at p is the subdivision of $\mathcal{K}$ given by replacing every simplex $T \in \mathcal{K}$ that contains p by the set of all simplexes of the form $\text{conv}(F \cup \{p\})$, where F is any face of T that does not contain p (see [9, III, 2.1] or [18, p. 376]).

For any regular 1-simplex $E = \text{conv}(v_0, v_1) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, the *Farey mediant* of E is the rational point v of E whose homogeneous correspondent $\tilde{v}$ coincides with $\tilde{v}_0 + \tilde{v}_1$. If E belongs to a regular complex Δ and v is the Farey mediant of E then the blow-up $\Delta_{(v)}$, called *binary Farey blow-up*, is a regular complex.

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose we are given rational polyhedra $Q \subseteq P \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ and a regular complex Δ with support P . Then there is a subdivision $\Delta^\natural$ of Δ obtained by binary Farey blow-ups, such that $Q = \bigcup \{T \in \Delta^\natural \mid T \subseteq Q\}$.*

Proof. We closely follow the argument of the proof in [16, p.539]. Let us write $Q = T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_t$ for suitable rational simplexes. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \dots, H_h\}$ be a set of rational half-spaces in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that every T_j is the intersection of halfspaces of $\mathcal{H}$. Using the De Concini-Procesi theorem [9, p.252], we obtain a sequence of regular complexes $\Delta = \Delta_0, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r$ where each Δ_{k+1} is obtained by blowing-up Δ_k at the Farey mediant of some 1-simplex of Δ_k , and for each $i = 1, \dots, h$, the convex polyhedron $H_i \cap [0, 1]^n$ is a union of simplexes of Δ_r . It follows that each simplex $T_1, \dots, T_t$ is a union of simplexes of Δ_r . Now $\Delta^\natural = \Delta_r$ yields the desired subdivision of Δ . $\square$

The following proposition states that every ℓ -ideal I of $\mathcal{M}(P)$ is uniquely determined by the zerosets of all functions in I :

Proposition 2.6. *Let $P \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ be a rational polyhedron and I an ℓ -ideal of $\mathcal{M}(P)$. Then for every $f \in \mathcal{M}(P)$ we have: $f \in I$ iff $f^{-1}(0) \supseteq g^{-1}(0)$ for some $g \in I$.*

Proof. For the nontrivial direction, suppose $f^{-1}(0) \supseteq g^{-1}(0)$ and without loss of generality, $g \geq 0$, and $f \geq 0$. We must find $0 \leq m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $mg \geq f$. Since $f, g \in \mathcal{M}(P)$, by suitably subdividing the regular complex given by Lemma 2.4 we obtain a complex Δ all of whose simplexes $T_1, \dots, T_s$ have rational vertices, with $\bigcup T_i = P$ and such that over every T_i both f and g are linear. Fix $T_i \in \Delta$, since for every vertex v of T_i , $f(v) \neq 0$ implies $g(v) \neq 0$, it is easy to find an integer $m_i > 0$ such that $m_i g \geq f$ over T_i . Now let $m = \max(m_1, \dots, m_u)$. $\square$

Further immediate properties of zerosets are recorded here for later use:

Proposition 2.7. *If I is an ℓ -ideal of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)$, $P \in \mathcal{Z}(I)$ and $0 \leq f$ is the restriction to P of some $k \in I$ (in symbols $f = k \upharpoonright P$), then there is an extension $\tilde{f}$ of f such that $\tilde{f} \in I$ and $\tilde{f} > 0$ over $[0, 1]^m \setminus P$. Thus $\mathcal{Z}(f) = \mathcal{Z}(\tilde{f})$ for some $\tilde{f} \in I$.*

Proposition 2.8. *Let I be an ℓ -ideal of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)$ and $P \in \mathcal{Z}(I)$. Define*

- (i) $I \upharpoonright P = \{f \upharpoonright P \mid f \in I\}$,
- (ii) $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P} = \{X \cap P \mid X \in \mathcal{Z}(I)\}$,
- (iii) $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\subseteq P} = \{X \in \mathcal{Z}(I) \mid X \subseteq P\}$.

Then $\mathcal{Z}(I \upharpoonright P) = \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P} = \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\subseteq P}$.

3. $\mathbb{Z}$ -HOMEOMORPHISM AND UNITAL ℓ -ISOMORPHISM

Given rational polyhedra $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ and $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, a piecewise linear homeomorphism η of P onto Q is said to be a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism, in symbols, $\eta: P \cong_{\mathbb{Z}} Q$, if all linear pieces of η and η^{-1} have integer coefficients.

The following first main result of this paper highlights the mutual relations between $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphisms of polyhedra and unital ℓ -isomorphisms of finitely generated unital ℓ -groups, as represented by Corollary 2.2:

Theorem 3.1. *For any ℓ -ideals I of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)$ and J of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)/I \cong \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)/J$.
- (ii) *For some $P \in \mathcal{Z}(I)$, $Q \in \mathcal{Z}(J)$ and $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism η of P onto Q , the map $X \mapsto \eta(X)$ sends $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$ one-one onto $\mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$.*

Proof. (i) $\rightarrow$ (ii) For definiteness, let us write $\iota: \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)/I \cong \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)/J$, and $\epsilon = \iota^{-1}$. Let id_m denote the identity $(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_m)$ over the m -cube, and id_n the identity over the n -cube. Each element $\pi_i/I \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)/I$ is sent by ι to some element $a_i/J \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)/J$. Writing $[0, 1] \ni ((a_i/J) \vee 0) \wedge 1 = ((a_i \vee 0) \wedge 1)/J$, and replacing, if necessary, a_i by $(a_i \vee 0) \wedge 1$, it is no loss of generality to assume that a_i belongs to the unit interval of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$, i.e., the range of a_i is contained in the unit interval $[0, 1]$. Thus for a suitable m -tuple $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ of functions $a_i \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ we have $a: [0, 1]^m \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$. Symmetrically, for some $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n): [0, 1]^m \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$, $b_j \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)$ we can write

$$\iota: \text{id}_m/I \mapsto a/J \text{ and } \epsilon: \text{id}_n/J \mapsto b/I. \quad (2)$$

For any $f \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)$ and $g \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$, arguing by induction on the number of operations in f and g in the light of Theorem 2.1, we get the following generalization of (2):

$$\iota: f/I \mapsto (f \circ a)/J \text{ and } \epsilon: g/J \mapsto (g \circ b)/I. \quad (3)$$

It follows that

$$\frac{f}{I} = (\epsilon \circ \iota) \frac{f}{I} = \epsilon(\iota(\frac{f}{I})) = \epsilon(\frac{f \circ a}{J}) = \frac{f \circ a \circ b}{I}.$$

By definition of the congruence induced by I , the function $|\pi_i - a_i \circ b| = |\pi_i - \pi_i \circ a \circ b|$ belongs to I , ($i = 1, \dots, m$). Here, as usual, $|\cdot|$ denotes absolute value. It follows that the function $e = \sum_{i=1}^m |\pi_i - a_i \circ b|$ belongs to I , and its zeroset $\mathcal{Z}(e)$ belongs to $\mathcal{Z}(I)$. The set $P = \mathcal{Z}(e)$ satisfies the identity

$$P = \{x \in [0, 1]^m \mid (a \circ b)(x) = x\}.$$

One similarly notes that the set $Q = \{y \in [0, 1]^n \mid (b \circ a)(y) = y\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{Z}(J)$. By construction, the restriction of b to P provides a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism η of P onto Q , whose inverse θ is the restriction of a to Q . In symbols,

$$b \upharpoonright P = \eta: P \cong_{\mathbb{Z}} Q, \quad a \upharpoonright Q = \theta: Q \cong_{\mathbb{Z}} P.$$

Suppose $Y \in \mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$, with the intent of proving that $\theta(Y) \in \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$. By Proposition 2.7, we can write $Y = \mathcal{Z}(k) = \mathcal{Z}(k \upharpoonright Q)$ for some $0 \leq k \in J$. By (3), the composite function $k \circ b$ belongs to I . Since $e \in I$, $k \circ b + e \in I$. Because $\mathcal{Z}(e) = P$, the function $k \circ b + e$ coincides with $k \circ b$ over P , and we have

$$\theta(Y) = \theta(\mathcal{Z}(k \upharpoonright Q)) = \mathcal{Z}((k \upharpoonright Q) \circ \eta) = \mathcal{Z}(k \circ \eta) = \mathcal{Z}(k \circ b \upharpoonright P) =$$

$$\mathcal{Z}(k \circ b + e) = P \cap \mathcal{Z}(k \circ b) \in \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$$

as desired. Reversing the roles of θ and η , we have the required one-one correspondence $X \mapsto \eta(X)$ of $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$ onto $\mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$.

(ii) $\rightarrow$ (i) Let I_P (resp., let J_Q) be the ℓ -ideal of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)$ (resp., of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$) given by those functions that vanish over P (resp., over Q). By [13, 5.2] we have unital ℓ -isomorphisms

$$\alpha: \mathcal{M}(P) \cong \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m) / I_P \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha(I \upharpoonright P) = I / I_P \quad (4)$$

and

$$\beta: \mathcal{M}(Q) \cong \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) / J_Q \quad \text{with} \quad \beta(J \upharpoonright Q) = J / J_Q. \quad (5)$$

As a particular case of a general algebraic result, the map

$$\frac{f / I_P}{I / I_P} \mapsto \frac{f}{I}$$

is a unital ℓ -isomorphism of $\frac{\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m) / I_P}{I / I_P}$ onto $\frac{\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)}{I}$. From (4)-(5) we have unital ℓ -isomorphisms

$$\frac{\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)}{I} \cong \frac{\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m) / I_P}{I / I_P} \cong \frac{\mathcal{M}(P)}{I \upharpoonright P} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\frac{\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)}{J} \cong \frac{\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) / J_Q}{J / J_Q} \cong \frac{\mathcal{M}(Q)}{J \upharpoonright Q}. \quad (7)$$

Letting $\theta = \eta^{-1}$, we have $\theta: Q \cong_{\mathbb{Z}} P$ and the map $\lambda: k \mapsto k \circ \theta$ is a unital ℓ -isomorphism of $\mathcal{M}(P)$ onto $\mathcal{M}(Q)$. Further, the map $Y \mapsto \theta(Y)$ sends $\mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q} = \mathcal{Z}(J \upharpoonright Q)$ one-one onto $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P} = \mathcal{Z}(I \upharpoonright P)$.

Claim. The restriction of λ to the ℓ -ideal $I \upharpoonright P$ of $\mathcal{M}(P)$ maps $I \upharpoonright P$ one-one onto $J \upharpoonright Q$. Thus the map

$$\frac{k}{I \upharpoonright P} \mapsto \frac{\lambda(k)}{\lambda(I \upharpoonright P)}$$

defines a unital ℓ -isomorphism of $\mathcal{M}(P) / (I \upharpoonright P)$ onto $\mathcal{M}(Q) / (J \upharpoonright Q)$.

By Proposition 2.8, for each $l \in \mathcal{M}(P)$ if $l \in I \upharpoonright P$ then $\mathcal{Z}(l) \in \mathcal{Z}(I \upharpoonright P) = \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$. Thus by definition of λ , $\mathcal{Z}(\lambda(l)) = \mathcal{Z}(l \circ \theta) = \eta(\mathcal{Z}(l)) \in \mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$, i.e., $\lambda(l) \in J \upharpoonright Q$.

Reversing the roles of λ and λ^{-1} , our claim is settled.

From (6) it now follows that the map

$$\frac{g}{I} \mapsto \frac{g \upharpoonright P}{I \upharpoonright P} \mapsto \frac{\lambda(g \upharpoonright P)}{\lambda(I \upharpoonright P)} = \frac{(g \upharpoonright P) \circ \theta}{J \upharpoonright Q}$$

is a unital ℓ -isomorphism of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m) / I$ onto $\mathcal{M}(Q) / (J \upharpoonright Q)$. From (7) we obtain the desired conclusion. $\square$

We will make use of the following

Lemma 3.2. *Let Δ be a regular complex whose support is contained in the n -cube. Let η be a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism defined over $|\Delta|$. Then there is a regular complex Δ' obtained from Δ by binary Farey blow-ups, such that η is linear over each simplex of Δ' .*

Proof. Since η has only finitely many pieces and each piece is linear with integer coefficients, a routine argument yields a (rational, simplicial) complex ∇ with support $|\Delta|$ such that η is linear over every simplex of ∇ . Now iterated application of Proposition 2.5 yields the desired regular complex Δ' . $\square$

For later purposes, we record here the following trivial property of *linear* $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphisms:

Lemma 3.3. *Let $T = \text{conv}(v_0, \dots, v_k) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ and $U = \text{conv}(w_0, \dots, w_k) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be regular k -simplexes. If $\text{den}(v_i) = \text{den}(w_i)$ for all $i = 0, \dots, k$, then there is precisely one linear $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism η_T of T onto U such that $\eta_T(v_i) = w_i$ for all i .*

Lemma 3.4. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a regular simplex and $\eta: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism which is linear over S . Let $\eta(S) = S'$. Then S' is a regular simplex.*

Proof. For some integer vector $b = (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ and $m \times n$ integer matrix $\mathcal{M}$ we have $\eta(x) = \mathcal{M}x + b$ for each $x \in S$. Let $r_{i1}, \dots, r_{in}$ be the i th row of $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_S$ be the $(m+1) \times (n+1)$ integer matrix whose i th row is $(r_{i1}, \dots, r_{in}, b_i)$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and whose bottom row is $(0, \dots, 0, 1)$. The homogeneous linear map $(x, 1) \mapsto \mathcal{M}_S(x, 1)$ sends each vector $(x, 1) \in S \times \{1\}$ into a vector $(y, 1) \in S' \times \{1\}$. Let $\tilde{v}_0, \dots, \tilde{v}_j \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ be the homogeneous correspondents of the vertices $v_0, \dots, v_j$ of S and let

$$S^\uparrow = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \tilde{v}_0 + \dots + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \tilde{v}_j$$

be the positive span of $\tilde{v}_0, \dots, \tilde{v}_j$. Similarly let $S'^\uparrow$ be the positive span in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ of the integer vectors $\mathcal{M}_S \tilde{v}_0, \dots, \mathcal{M}_S \tilde{v}_j$. By construction, $\mathcal{M}_S$ sends integer points of $S^\uparrow$ one-one into integer points of $S'^\uparrow$. Interchanging the roles of η and η^{-1} , we see that $\mathcal{M}_S$ actually sends the set of integer points in $S^\uparrow$ one-one *onto* the set of integer points of $S'^\uparrow$. By Blichfeldt theorem, [12], the regularity of S is equivalent to saying that the half-open parallelepiped $Q_S = \{\mu_0 \tilde{v}_0 + \dots + \mu_j \tilde{v}_j \mid 0 \leq \mu_0, \dots, \mu_j < 1\}$ contains no nonzero integer points. One also has a similar characterization of the regularity of S' . The mentioned properties of $\mathcal{M}_S$, together with the assumed regularity of S ensure that S' is regular. $\square$

Corollary 3.5. *Let Δ be a regular complex and η a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism of $|\Delta|$ which is linear over each simplex of Δ . Then the set $\eta(\Delta) = \{\eta(S) \mid S \in \Delta\}$ is a regular complex.*

4. REALIZATIONS OF WEIGHTED ABSTRACT SIMPLICIAL COMPLEXES

We now turn to the combinatorial objects defined in the Introduction. For every regular complex Λ , the *skeleton* of Λ is the weighted abstract simplicial complex $W_\Lambda = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$ given by the following stipulations:

- (1) $\mathcal{V}$ = vertices of Λ .
- (2) For every vertex v of Λ , $\omega(v) = \text{den}(v)$.
- (3) For every subset $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$ of $\mathcal{V}$, $W \in \Sigma$ iff $\text{conv}(w_1, \dots, w_k) \in \Lambda$.

Given two weighted abstract simplicial complexes $W = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$ and $W' = (\mathcal{V}', \Sigma', \omega')$ we write

$$\gamma: W \cong W',$$

and we say that γ is a *combinatorial isomorphism* between W and W' , if γ is a one-one map from $\mathcal{V}$ onto $\mathcal{V}'$ such that $\omega'(\gamma(v)) = \omega(v)$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$, and $\{w_1, \dots, w_k\} \in \Sigma$ iff $\{\gamma(w_1), \dots, \gamma(w_k)\} \in \Sigma'$ for each subset $\{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$ of $\mathcal{V}$.

Definition 4.1. Let W be a weighted abstract simplicial complex and ∇ a regular complex. Then a ∇ -realization of W is a combinatorial isomorphism ι between W and the skeleton W_∇ of ∇ . We write $\iota: W \rightarrow \nabla$ to mean that ι is a ∇ -realization of W .

Examples of realizations. For any regular complex Λ , the identity function over the set of vertices of Λ is a Λ -realization of W_Λ , called the *trivial realization of the skeleton* W_Λ .

Symmetrically, let $W = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$ be a weighted abstract simplicial complex with vertex set $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. For $e_1, \dots, e_n$ the standard basis vectors of $\mathbb{R}^n$, let Δ_W be the complex whose vertices are

$$v'_1 = e_1/\omega(v_1), \dots, v'_n = e_n/\omega(v_n),$$

and whose k -simplexes ($k = 0, \dots, n$) are given by

$$\text{conv}(v'_{i(0)}, \dots, v'_{i(k)}) \in \Delta_W \text{ iff } \{v_{i(0)}, \dots, v_{i(k)}\} \in \Sigma.$$

Note that Δ_W is a regular complex and $|\Delta_W| \subseteq [0, 1]^n$. The function

$$\tilde{\iota}: v_i \in \mathcal{V} \mapsto v'_i \in [0, 1]^n \quad (8)$$

is a Δ_W -realization of W , called the *canonical realization* of W . The dependence on the order in which the elements $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ are listed, is tacitly understood.

Combining Lemma 3.3 with a routine patching argument we easily get

Lemma 4.2. *Let Λ and ∇ be regular complexes, with $|\Lambda| \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ and $|\nabla| \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. We then have:*

- (i) *If $\theta: W_\Lambda \cong W_\nabla$ is a combinatorial isomorphism between the skeletons of Λ and ∇ , then there is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism η_θ of $|\Lambda|$ onto $|\nabla|$ such that $\eta_\theta(v) = \theta(v)$ for each vertex v of Λ , and η_θ is linear over each simplex of Λ .*
- (ii) *Letting, in particular, $\nabla = \Delta_{W_\Lambda}$, it follows that the combinatorial isomorphism $\tilde{\iota}$ of (8) between W_Λ and W_∇ uniquely extends to a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism $\eta_{\tilde{\iota}}$ of $|\Lambda|$ onto $|\nabla|$ such that $\eta_{\tilde{\iota}}$ is linear over each simplex of Λ .*

Filtering and confluent sets of rational polyhedra. Given a set E , a non-empty family $\mathcal{P}$ of subsets of E is said to be *filtering* if whenever $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}$ there is $Z \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $Z \subseteq X \cap Y$. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is another filtering sequence of subsets of E , we say that $\mathcal{P}$ *minorizes* $\mathcal{Q}$, if for all $A \in \mathcal{Q}$ there is $B \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $B \subseteq A$. If $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ happen to minorize each other, we say that $\mathcal{P}$ is *confluent* with $\mathcal{Q}$, and we write

$$\mathcal{P} \uparrow \mathcal{Q}.$$

Lemma 4.3. *If $\mathcal{P}$ is a filtering family of rational polyhedra in the n -cube then the set*

$$\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle = \{f \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) \mid \mathcal{Z}(f) \supseteq Q \text{ for some } Q \in \mathcal{P}\}$$

is an ℓ -ideal of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$.

Proof. The zero function belongs to $\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ because $\mathcal{P}$ is nonempty. If $0 \leq f \in \langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ and $0 \leq g \leq f$ then $g \in \langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ because $\mathcal{Z}(g) \supseteq \mathcal{Z}(f)$. Finally, from $0 \leq f, 0 \leq g$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{P}$ it follows that $f + g \in \mathcal{P}$ because $\mathcal{Z}(f + g) = \mathcal{Z}(f) \cap \mathcal{Z}(g) \supseteq X \cap Y$ for some $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}$. Thus $\mathcal{Z}(f + g) \supseteq Q$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{P}$. $\square$

Confluence is an equivalence relation between filtering families $\mathcal{P}$ of rational polyhedra in the n -cube. The equivalence classes are in one-one correspondence with ℓ -ideals of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ via the map $\mathcal{P} \mapsto \langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$. Specifically, we have the following result, which will be used without explicit mention throughout the rest of this paper:

Proposition 4.4. *Given filtering families $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ of rational polyhedra in the same n -cube, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{Q} \rangle$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{P} \uparrow \mathcal{Q}$.
- (iii) $\mathcal{Z}(\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle) = \mathcal{Z}(\langle \mathcal{Q} \rangle)$.

Proof. (iii) $\leftrightarrow$ (i) By Proposition 2.6, the ℓ -ideals $\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{Q} \rangle$ are uniquely determined by their zerosets. (i) $\rightarrow$ (ii) Suppose $A \in \mathcal{P}$ is such that there is no $B \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $B \subseteq A$. By Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, there is $f \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ with $\mathcal{Z}(f) = A$, and hence, $f \in \langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$. Our hypothesis about A ensures that $f \notin \langle \mathcal{Q} \rangle$. (ii) $\rightarrow$ (i) is trivial. $\square$

Stellar transformations. Let $W = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$ and W' be two weighted abstract simplicial complexes. A map $\flat : W \rightarrow W'$ is called a *stellar transformation* if $\flat$ is either a deletion of a maximal set of Σ , or a binary subdivision, (as defined in the Introduction) or else $\flat$ is the identity map.

Recalling Definition 4.1 we have

Lemma 4.5. *Let $W = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$ and $W' = (\mathcal{V}', \Sigma', \omega')$ be two weighted abstract simplicial complexes, Δ a regular complex, and ι a Δ -realization of W , $\iota : W \rightarrow \Delta$. Suppose that $\flat : W \rightarrow W'$ is a stellar transformation.*

- (i) *In case $\flat$ deletes a maximal set $M \in \Sigma$, let $\flat(\iota) : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta'$ delete from Δ the corresponding maximal simplex $\text{conv}(\iota(M))$. Then the map $\iota' = \iota \upharpoonright \mathcal{V}'$ is a Δ' -realization of W' .*
- (ii) *In case $\flat$ is the binary subdivision $W' = (\{a, b\}c)W$ at some two-element set $E = \{a, b\} \in \Sigma$, and $c \notin \mathcal{V}$, let e be the Farey median of the 1-simplex $\text{conv}(\iota(E))$. Let $\flat(\iota)$ be the Farey blow-up $\Delta' = \Delta_{(e)}$ of Δ at e . Then the map $\iota' = \iota \cup \{(c, e)\}$ is a Δ' -realization of W' .*

Further, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{\flat} & W' \\ \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \iota' \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow{\flat(\iota)} & \Delta' \end{array}$$

We say that $\flat(\iota)$ is the Δ -transformation of $\flat$. (It is tacitly understood that if $\flat$ is the identity map, then $\flat(\iota) : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta'$ is the identity function.)

5. CLASSIFICATION OF UNITAL ℓ -GROUPS

In this section we will construct a map $\mathcal{W} \mapsto \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$, from stellar sequences to unital ℓ -groups and prove that the map is onto all finitely generated unital ℓ -groups.

Main Construction. Let $\mathcal{W} = W_0, W_1, \dots$ be a stellar sequence. For each $j = 0, 1, \dots$ let b_j be the corresponding stellar transformation sending W_j to W_{j+1} . For some $n \geq 1$ and regular complex Δ_0 in the n -cube let ι_0 be a Δ_0 -realization of W_0 . Then Lemma 4.5 yields a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} W_0 & \xrightarrow{b_0} & W_1 & \xrightarrow{b_1} & W_2 & \dots & \\ \downarrow \iota_0 & & \downarrow \iota_1 & & \downarrow \iota_2 & & \\ \Delta_0 & \xrightarrow{b_0(\iota_0)} & \Delta_1 & \xrightarrow{b_1(\iota_1)} & \Delta_2 & \dots & \end{array} \quad (9)$$

The sequence of supports $|\Delta_0| \supseteq |\Delta_1| \supseteq \dots$ is called the Δ_0 -orbit of $\mathcal{W}$ and is denoted $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0)$ (the role of ι_0 being tacitly understood). As in Lemma 4.3, the filtering set $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0)$ determines the ℓ -ideal $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0) = \langle \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0) \rangle$ of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$, as well as the unital ℓ -group $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0) = \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) / \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0)$. In the particular case when ι_0 is the canonical realization of W_0 we write

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}), \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}), \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$$

instead of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{W_0}), \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{W_0}), \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{W_0})$.

Various examples of the map $\mathcal{W} \mapsto \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ will be given in 7.2 below.

Our second main result is the following

Theorem 5.1. *For every finitely generated unital ℓ -group (G, u) there is a stellar sequence $\mathcal{W}$ such that $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong (G, u)$.*

As a preliminary step for the proof we need the following immediate consequence of the definitions:

Lemma 5.2. *For any weighted abstract simplicial complex W and regular complexes ∇ and Δ , let ι be a ∇ -realization of W , and ϵ a Δ -realization of W . Let $\eta_\gamma: |\nabla| \rightarrow |\Delta|$ be the $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism of Lemma 4.2 corresponding to the combinatorial isomorphism $\gamma = \epsilon \circ \iota^{-1}$. Suppose the stellar transformation b transforms W into W' . Let the commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta & \xrightarrow{b(\epsilon)} & \Delta' \\ \uparrow \epsilon & & \uparrow \epsilon' \\ W & \xrightarrow{b} & W' \\ \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \iota' \\ \nabla & \xrightarrow{b(\iota)} & \nabla' \end{array} \quad (10)$$

be as given by Lemma 4.5(ii). Let further $\gamma' = \epsilon' \circ \iota'^{-1}$, and $\eta_{\gamma'}$ be the $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism of $|\nabla'|$ onto $|\Delta'|$ given by Lemma 4.2. Then $\eta_\gamma \upharpoonright |\nabla'| = \eta_{\gamma'}$, whence in particular $\eta_{\gamma'}$ is linear over each simplex of $|\nabla'|$.

We next prove

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{W} = W_0, W_1, \dots$ be a stellar sequence. Let ϵ_0 be a Δ_0 -realization of W_0 and ι_0 be a ∇_0 -realization of W_0 . Then $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0) \cong \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}, \nabla_0)$.*

Proof. Let us write for short $I = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0)$, $J = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}, \nabla_0)$, $P = |\Delta_0|$ and $Q = |\nabla_0|$. Then $P \in \mathcal{Z}(I)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Z}(J)$. In the light of Theorem 3.1 it is enough to exhibit a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism η of P onto Q mapping $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$ one-one onto $\mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$. By definition of realization, there is a combinatorial isomorphism ξ of W_{Δ_0} onto W_{∇_0} .

By Lemma 4.2 (i), ξ can be extended to a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism η of P onto Q , which is linear over each simplex of Δ_0 . Lemma 5.2 now yields $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphisms

$$\eta \upharpoonright |\Delta_i| : |\Delta_i| \cong_{\mathbb{Z}} |\nabla_i|, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad (11)$$

with $\eta \upharpoonright |\Delta_i|$ linear on every simplex of Δ_i . Since every $X \in \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$ contains some $|\Delta_i| \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0)$ then by (11),

$$Q \supseteq \eta(X) \supseteq \eta(|\Delta_i|) = |\nabla_i| \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}, \nabla_0),$$

whence by Proposition 2.6, $\eta(X) \in \mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$. Reversing the roles of η and η^{-1} we conclude that the map $X \mapsto \eta(X)$ sends $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$ one-one onto $\mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$, as desired. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By Corollary 2.2 there exists an integer $n > 0$ such that (G, u) is unitaly ℓ -isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) / I$ for some ℓ -ideal I of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$. We list the elements of I in a sequence $f_0, f_1, \dots$. Let $P_i = \bigcap_{j=0}^i \mathcal{Z}(f_j)$, for each $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

Since $\mathcal{Z}(f_i) \in \mathcal{Z}(I)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(I)$ is closed under finite intersections, P_i belongs to $\mathcal{Z}(I)$. Moreover, for each $f \in I$ there is $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ such that $P_j \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(f)$. Thus the filtering family $\{P_0, P_1, \dots\}$ is confluent with $\mathcal{Z}(I)$, in symbols,

$$\{P_0, P_1, \dots\} \uparrow \mathcal{Z}(I). \quad (12)$$

By Lemma 2.4, P_0 is the support of a regular complex Δ_0 . Proposition 2.5 yields a finite sequence of regular complexes

$$\Delta_{0,0}, \Delta_{0,1}, \dots, \Delta_{0,k_0}$$

having the following properties:

- (1) $\Delta_{0,0} = \Delta_0$;
- (2) for each $t = 1, 2, \dots$, $\Delta_{0,t}$ is obtained by blowing-up $\Delta_{0,t-1}$ at the Farey mediant of some 1-simplex $E \in \Delta_{0,t-1}$;
- (3) P_1 is a union of simplexes of Δ_{0,k_0} .

Let the sequence of regular complexes $\Delta_{0,k_0}, \Delta_{0,k_0+1}, \dots, \Delta_{0,r_0}$ be obtained by the following procedure: for each $i > 0$, delete in Δ_{0,k_0+i-1} a maximal simplex T which is not contained in P_1 ; denote by Δ_{0,k_0+i} the resulting complex; stop when no such T exists. Then the sequence of skeletons $W_{\Delta_{0,0}}, \dots, W_{\Delta_{0,k_0}}, \dots, W_{\Delta_{0,r_0}}$ is a finite initial segment of a stellar sequence and $|\Delta_{0,r_0}| = P_1$. Let us write $\Delta_{1,0}$ instead of Δ_{0,r_0} . Proceeding inductively, we obtain a sequence $\mathcal{S}$ of regular complexes

$$\mathcal{S} = \Delta_{0,0}, \dots, \Delta_{1,0}, \dots, \Delta_{2,0}, \dots, \Delta_{j,0}, \dots$$

such that $P_j = |\Delta_{j,0}|$ for each $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

To conclude the proof, let $\mathcal{W}$ be the stellar sequence given by the skeletons of the regular complexes in $\mathcal{S}$. Let ρ be the trivial Δ_0 -realization of the skeleton W_{Δ_0} of Δ_0 . Recalling (12) we get

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{0,0}) = \{|\Delta_{0,0}|, \dots, |\Delta_{1,0}|, \dots\} \uparrow \{P_0, P_1, \dots\} \uparrow \mathcal{Z}(I).$$

Applying Lemma 5.3 and Proposition 4.4 we obtain

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_0) = \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) / I \cong (G, u),$$

which concludes the proof. $\square$

6. STELLAR SEQUENCES OF ISOMORPHIC UNITAL ℓ -GROUPS

In this section we give simple necessary and sufficient conditions for two stellar sequences to generate isomorphic unital ℓ -groups:

Theorem 6.1. *For any two stellar sequences $\mathcal{W}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ let us write $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}) = |\Delta_0| \supseteq |\Delta_1| \supseteq \dots$, and $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}}) = |\bar{\Delta}_0| \supseteq |\bar{\Delta}_1| \supseteq \dots$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong \mathcal{G}(\bar{\mathcal{W}})$.
- (ii) *For some integer $i \geq 0$ there is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism η of $|\Delta_i|$ such that $\{\eta(|\Delta_i|), \eta(|\Delta_{i+1}|), \dots\} \uparrow \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}})$.*

Proof. Writing for short $I = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})$ and $J = \mathcal{I}(\bar{\mathcal{W}})$, we have $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)/I$ and $\mathcal{G}(\bar{\mathcal{W}}) = \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)/J$. Thus

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(I), \text{ and } \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}) \text{ minorizes } \mathcal{Z}(I) \quad (13)$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}}) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(J), \text{ and } \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}}) \text{ minorizes } \mathcal{Z}(J). \quad (14)$$

(i) $\rightarrow$ (ii). Theorem 3.1 (i) $\rightarrow$ (ii) gives rational polyhedra $P \in \mathcal{Z}(I)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Z}(J)$, and a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism η of P onto Q such that $X \mapsto \eta(X)$ maps $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$ one-one onto $\mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$. By (13), there exists an i such that $|\Delta_i| \subseteq P$. Define $D = |\Delta_i|$ and $E = \eta(D)$. Then

$$X \mapsto \eta(X) \text{ maps } \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap D} \text{ one-one onto } \mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap E}. \quad (15)$$

In the light of Proposition 2.8, from $D \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ we get $D \in \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\subseteq D} = \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap D}$, whence $E \in \mathcal{Z}(J)_{\subseteq E} = \mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap E}$. Upon writing

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})_{\cap D} = \{X \cap D \mid X \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})\} \text{ and } \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}})_{\cap E} = \{Y \cap E \mid Y \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}})\},$$

by (14) we have the confluence $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})_{\cap D} \uparrow \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap D}$. Similarly, $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}})_{\cap E} \uparrow \mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap E}$, whence $\eta(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})_{\cap D}) \uparrow \eta(\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap D})$. Recalling now (15), we obtain $\eta(\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap D}) = \mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap E} \uparrow \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}})_{\cap E}$. Recalling that $E \supseteq |\bar{\Delta}_j|$, for some integer $j \geq 0$ we get

$$\{\eta(|\Delta_i|), \eta(|\Delta_{i+1}|), \dots\} = \eta(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})_{\cap D}) \uparrow \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}})_{\cap E} \uparrow \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}}),$$

as required.

(ii) $\rightarrow$ (i) Writing $P = |\Delta_i|$ and $Q = \eta(P)$, we have $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P} \uparrow \mathcal{Z}(I) \uparrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}) \uparrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})_{\cap P}$. By hypothesis, $\eta(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})_{\cap P}) \uparrow \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathcal{W}}) \uparrow \mathcal{Z}(J)$. Since $P \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ then $Q \in \mathcal{Z}(J)$. For every $Y \in \mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$ there is $Z \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})_{\cap P}$ such that $\eta(Z) \subseteq Y$. Thus $Z \subseteq \eta^{-1}(Y) \subseteq P$, whence $\eta^{-1}(Y)$ belongs to $\mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P}$. Reversing the roles of η and η^{-1} we see that the map $X \in \mathcal{Z}(I)_{\cap P} \mapsto \eta(X)$ is (one-one) onto $\mathcal{Z}(J)_{\cap Q}$. An application of Theorem 3.1 (ii) $\rightarrow$ (i) provides the required unital ℓ -isomorphism $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^m)/I \cong \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)/J$. $\square$

Our second characterization depends on the following

Definition 6.2. Two stellar sequences $\mathcal{W} = W_0, W_1, \dots$ and $\mathcal{W}' = W'_0, W'_1, \dots$ are *strongly equivalent* if there are realizations $\rho : W_0 \rightarrow \nabla_0$ of W_0 and $\rho' : W'_0 \rightarrow \nabla'_0$ of W'_0 in the same d -cube, whose orbits are confluent, $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}, \nabla_0) \uparrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}', \nabla'_0)$.

Theorem 6.3. *For any two stellar sequences $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}'$, $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}')$ if and only if there is a stellar sequence $\mathcal{W}''$ which is strongly equivalent to $\mathcal{W}$ and to $\mathcal{W}'$.*

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$) This is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 5.3. ($\Rightarrow$) Let us write $\mathcal{W} = W_0, W_1, \dots$ and $\mathcal{W}' = W'_0, W'_1, \dots$. Let $\rho_0: W_0 \rightarrow \Delta_0$ and $\rho'_0: W'_0 \rightarrow \Delta'_0$ be the canonical realizations of W_0 and W'_0 , respectively in the m - and in the n -cube. Then Lemma 4.5 yields commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} W_0 & \xrightarrow{b_0} & W_1 & \xrightarrow{b_1} & W_2 & \dots & \\ \downarrow \rho_0 & & \downarrow \rho_1 & & \downarrow \rho_2 & & \\ \Delta_0 & \xrightarrow{b_0(\rho_0)} & \Delta_1 & \xrightarrow{b_1(\rho_1)} & \Delta_2 & \dots & \end{array} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} W'_0 & \xrightarrow{b'_0} & W'_1 & \xrightarrow{b'_1} & W'_2 & \dots & \\ \downarrow \rho'_0 & & \downarrow \rho'_1 & & \downarrow \rho'_2 & & \\ \Delta'_0 & \xrightarrow{b'_0(\rho'_0)} & \Delta'_1 & \xrightarrow{b'_1(\rho'_1)} & \Delta'_2 & \dots & \end{array} \quad (17)$$

Next, Theorem 3.1 yields two polyhedra $P \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}))$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}'))$, and a $\mathbb{Z}$ -homeomorphism $\eta: P \rightarrow Q$ such that the map $X \mapsto \eta(X)$ sends $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})) \subseteq P$ one-one onto $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}')) \subseteq Q$. Since $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ is confluent with $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}))$ there is $|\Delta_{i^*}| \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $|\Delta_{i^*}| \subseteq P$. We will build a sequence

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\Theta_{0,0}, \dots, \Theta_{0,n_0}, \Theta_{1,0}, \dots, \Theta_{1,n_1}, \Theta_{2,0}, \dots, \Theta_{2,n_2}, \dots, \Theta_{j,0}, \dots, \Theta_{j,n_j}, \dots\}$$

of regular complexes having the following properties:

- (i) for each $j \geq 0$, η respects Θ_{j,n_j} , in the sense that η is linear over each simplex of Θ_{j,n_j} ;
- (ii) Θ_{j,n_j} is a subdivision of Δ_{i^*+j} , ($j = 0, 1, \dots$).

Construction of $\mathcal{S}$. Setting $\Theta_{0,0} = \Delta_{i^*}$, by Lemma 3.2 we have a sequence of binary Farey blow-ups $\Theta_{0,0}, \Theta_{0,1}, \dots, \Theta_{0,n_0}$ such that η respects Θ_{0,n_0} . Thus conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied for $j = 0$. Proceeding by induction, and writing $k = i^* + j$, let Θ_{j,n_j} be a subdivision of Δ_k such that η respects Θ_{j,n_j} . The sequence sequence $\Theta_{j+1,0}, \dots, \Theta_{j+1,n_{j+1}}$ is now constructed arguing by cases:

Case 1: $b_k: W_k \rightarrow W_{k+1}$ is a binary subdivision. Then the Δ_k -transformation $b_k(\rho_k): \Delta_k \rightarrow \Delta_{k+1}$ is a binary Farey blow-up. Again, Lemma 3.2 guarantees the existence of a sequence $\Theta_{j,n_j}, \Theta_{j+1,0}, \dots, \Theta_{j+1,n_{j+1}}$ of binary Farey blow-ups such that $\Theta_{j+1,n_{j+1}}$ is a subdivision of Δ_{k+1} . By induction hypothesis, η respects $\Theta_{j+1,n_{j+1}}$.

Case 2: $b_k: W_k \rightarrow W_{k+1}$ is a deletion of a maximal set M . Then by Lemma 4.5 the Δ_k -transformation $b_k(\rho_k): \Delta_k \rightarrow \Delta_{k+1}$ deletes the corresponding maximal simplex $\text{conv}(\rho_k(M))$. Since Θ_{j,n_j} is a subdivision of Δ_k , there is a finite sequence $\Theta_{j,n_j}, \Theta_{j+1,0}, \dots, \Theta_{j+1,n_{j+1}}$ such that every complex in the sequence is obtained from the previous one via a deletion of a maximal simplex and $\Theta_{j+1,n_{j+1}}$ is a subdivision of Δ_{k+1} . By induction hypothesis, η respects $\Theta_{j+1,n_{j+1}}$.

Case 3: $b_k: W_k \rightarrow W_{k+1}$ is the identity map. Then $\Delta_{k+1} = \Delta_k$ and it is sufficient to set $n_{j+1} = 0$ and $\Theta_{j+1,0} = \Theta_{j,n_j}$.

Defining now $\mathcal{W}'' = W_{\Theta_{0,n_0}}, W_{\Theta_{1,0}}, \dots, W_{\Theta_{1,n_1}}, \dots$, it follows that $\mathcal{W}''$ is a stellar sequence.

Claim 1: $\mathcal{W}$ is strongly equivalent to $\mathcal{W}''$.

As a matter of fact, the trivial realization of the skeleton of Θ_{0,n_0} yields the sequence of rational polyhedra

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}'', \Theta_{0,n_0}) = \{|\Theta_{0,n_0}|, |\Theta_{1,0}|, \dots, |\Theta_{1,n_1}|, \dots, |\Theta_{i,n_i}|, \dots\}.$$

By (ii), for all $j = 1, 2, \dots$, $|\Delta_{i^*+j}| = |\Theta_{j,n_j}|$. It follows that $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ is confluent with $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}'', \Theta_{0,n_0})$.

Claim 2: $\mathcal{W}'$ is strongly equivalent to $\mathcal{W}''$.

Let us write for short Θ instead of Θ_{0,n_0} . Let $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ be the set of vertices of Θ . We define the complex $\Lambda = \eta(\Theta)$ by the following stipulation:

$$\text{conv}(\eta(v_{i_0}), \dots, \eta(v_{i_p})) \in \Lambda \Leftrightarrow \text{conv}(v_{i_0}, \dots, v_{i_p}) \in \Theta.$$

Let $\mathcal{V}'$ be the set of vertices of Λ . Since η is linear on each simplex of Θ , by Corollary 3.5 Λ is a regular complex. Let the map $\xi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ be defined by $\xi(v) = \eta(v)$. Since η preserves least common denominators of rational vertices, ξ is a combinatorial isomorphism of W_Θ onto W_Λ , whence $\xi: W_\Theta \rightarrow \Lambda$ is a Λ -realization of W_Θ , and we have

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}'', \Lambda) = \{|\Lambda|, |\Lambda_{1,0}|, \dots, |\Lambda_{1,n_1}|, \dots\} = \{\eta(|\Theta|), \eta(|\Theta_{1,0}|), \dots, \eta(|\Theta_{1,n_1}|), \dots\}.$$

From $|\Delta_{i^*}| = |\Theta| \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}))_{\cap P}$ it follows that $|\Lambda_{i,j}|$ belongs to $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}'))_{\cap Q}$, for all i, j . Therefore, $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}')$ minorizes $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}'', \Lambda)$. Since $Q \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}'))$ then $|\Delta'_k| \subseteq Q$, for some k . From the hypothesis that η maps $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}))_{\cap P}$ one-one onto $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}'))_{\cap Q}$, it follows that $\eta^{-1}(|\Delta'_{k+l}|)$ belongs to $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}))_{\cap P}$, for all $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. In other words, there exists $j \geq 0$ such that $\eta^{-1}(|\Delta'_{k+l}|) \supseteq |\Delta_{i^*+j}| = |\Theta_{j,n_j}|$. Summing up, for each $l \geq 0$, there is $j \geq 0$ such that $|\Delta'_{k+l}| \supseteq \eta(|\Theta_{j,n_j}|) = |\Lambda_{j,n_j}|$, which settles our second claim and concludes the proof. $\square$

7. EXAMPLES AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Theorem 7.1. *For $\mathcal{W} = W_0, W_1, \dots$ a stellar sequence, let $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$, $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ be as given by our main construction. We then have:*

- (1) $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is finitely presented (i.e., the ℓ -ideal $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})$ is finitely generated) iff $\mathcal{W}$ has only finitely many deletion steps.
- (2) $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is finitely presented and its maximal spectrum ([3, 10.2.2], [13, Section 2]) has dimension at most 1 iff $\mathcal{W}$ has only finitely many deletion steps and for all large i all simplexes of W_i have at most two elements.
- (3) $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is simplicial [7, p.191] (i.e., $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is a finite product of unital ℓ -groups of the form $(\mathbb{Z}_{\frac{1}{n}}, 1)$) iff for all large i every simplex of W_i , other than the empty set, is a singleton.
- (4) $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is archimedean [3, 2.6.1], iff every rational polyhedron P containing the intersection $\bigcap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ of the zerosets of $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})$ also contains some zeroset $Q \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$.
- (5) $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is local (i.e., has precisely one maximal ℓ -ideal) iff $\bigcap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ is a singleton.
- (6) $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is unittally ℓ -isomorphic to a unital ℓ -subgroup of $(\mathbb{R}, 1)$ iff $\bigcap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ is a singleton $\{z\}$ and every rational polyhedron $P \ni z$ contains some $Q \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$.

- (7) $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is totally ordered iff for some (equivalently, for every) ∇ -realization of $\mathcal{W}$ (with ∇ a regular complex), we have: For all rational polyhedra P, Q with $P \cup Q = [0, 1]^n$ there is $0 \leq i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that either $|\nabla_i| \subseteq P$ or $|\nabla_i| \subseteq Q$.

Proof. We have

- (1) ($\Leftarrow$) Let W_u be such that no step after the u th step is a deletion. All supports $|\Delta_{W_{u+t}}|$ are equal to some fixed rational polyhedron P . Let J_P be the ℓ -ideal of all functions of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ that vanish over $|\Delta_{W_u}|$. By our main construction, $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) / J_P \cong \mathcal{M}(P)$, whence by [13, 5.2], $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is finitely presented.
- ($\Rightarrow$) Suppose $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is finitely presented. By [13, 5.2] the intersection $P = \bigcap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ is a rational polyhedron and we can identify $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\mathcal{M}(P)$. Further, $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is archimedean, and $\mathcal{M}(P) \cong \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) / \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})$. A rational polyhedron Q belongs to $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}))$ iff $Q \supseteq P$ iff Q is minorized by some $R \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$. In particular, taking $Q = P$ we see that P belongs to $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$, say $P = |\Delta_i|$. It follows that $|\Delta_i| = |\Delta_{i+1}| = \dots$
- (2) For some rational polyhedron P , $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ can be identified with $\mathcal{M}(P)$. Our assumption about the maximal spectrum of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is equivalent to saying that for all large i the i th element of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ is the same rational polyhedron P , and $\dim P \leq 1$. This means that no simplex of W_i has three elements.
- (3) This is a particular case of (2).
- (4) By [13, 2.3] the unital ℓ -group $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) / \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})$ is archimedean iff it is unittally ℓ -isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}(X)$ for some closed set $X \subseteq [0, 1]^n$. Identifying $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\mathcal{M}(X)$, the ℓ -ideal $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})$ turns out to coincide with the set of functions in $\mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ that vanish over $\bigcap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$, and $X = \bigcap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W}) = \bigcap \{\mathcal{Z}(f) \mid f \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})\}$. Thus if $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is archimedean every rational polyhedron P containing $\bigcap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ automatically contains some $Q \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$. If $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is not archimedean then some $f \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n)$ vanishing over $\bigcap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ does not belong to $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})$. Thus the rational polyhedron $\mathcal{Z}(f)$ contains $\bigcap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$ but does not contain any $Q \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$.
- (5) Trivial.
- (6) From the time-honored Hölder theorem, [3, 2.6], it follows that a unital ℓ -group is unittally ℓ -isomorphic to $(\mathbb{R}, 1)$ iff its only ℓ -ideal is $\{0\}$, iff it is archimedean and local.
- (7) Write J instead of $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W})$. As is well known, [3, 2.4.1], the quotient $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{M}([0, 1]^n) / J$ is totally ordered iff $f \wedge g = 0$ implies $f \in J$ or $g \in J$. Since (by Proposition 2.6) ideals are uniquely determined by their zerosets, this is equivalent to saying that for any two disjoint rational polyhedra $P = \mathcal{Z}(f)$ and $Q = \mathcal{Z}(g)$ such that $P \cup Q = [0, 1]^n$, either P or Q is the zeroset of some function $f \in J$. In other words, either P or Q is minorized by some $R \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{W})$. The same proof holds for any ∇ -realization.

□

Examples 7.2. We give a few instances of the map $\mathcal{W} \mapsto \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$:

- (1) $\mathcal{W}$ = the constant sequence $W, W, W, \dots$ where $W = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$, $\mathcal{V} = \{0, 1\}$, $\Sigma = \text{powerset}(\mathcal{V})$, and $\omega = 1$. Then $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$.

- (2) $\mathcal{W}$ = the constant sequence $W, W, \dots$ with $W = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$ such that $\mathcal{V} = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$, $\Sigma = \{\emptyset, \{w_1\}, \dots, \{w_k\}\}$ and $\omega(w_i) = n_i$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})$ is the simplicial group $(\mathbb{Z}_{\frac{1}{n_1}}, 1) \times \dots \times (\mathbb{Z}_{\frac{1}{n_k}}, 1)$.
- (3) $\mathcal{W}$ = the constant sequence $W, W, \dots$, where W is the skeleton of a regular complex Δ whose support is contained in $[0, 1]^n$. Then $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong \mathcal{M}(|\Delta|)$.
- (4) Let $W_0 = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$ where $\mathcal{V} = \{0, 1\}$, $\Sigma = \text{powerset}(\mathcal{V})$, and $\omega(v) = n$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Define W_i inductively by

$$W_i = \begin{cases} \text{subdivide the only existing 2-element set in } W_{i-1} & \text{if } i \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\ \text{delete the only 2-element set } X \text{ of } W_{i-1} \text{ with } 0 \notin X & \text{if } i \equiv 2 \pmod{3} \\ \text{delete the only maximal singleton } \{s\} \text{ of } W_{i-1} & \text{if } i \equiv 0 \pmod{3}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{W} = W_0, W_1, \dots$. Then $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong (\mathbb{Z} \otimes_{\text{lex}} \mathbb{Z}, (n, 0))$ is the unital ℓ -group given by the free abelian group $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with lexicographic ordering and with the element $(n, 0)$ as the order-unit.

- (5) For ξ an irrational in the unit real interval define the sequence of regular complexes $\Delta_0, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots$ as follows: let Δ_0 the complex given by the unit interval $[0, 1]$ and its faces; and for $i > 0$,

$$\Delta_i = \begin{cases} \text{do a Farey blow-up of the only 1-simplex in } \Delta_{i-1} & \text{if } i \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\ \text{delete the only 1-simplex } X \text{ of } \Delta_{i-1} \text{ with } \xi \notin X & \text{if } i \equiv 2 \pmod{3} \\ \text{delete the only maximal 0-simplex } \{s\} \text{ of } \Delta_{i-1} & \text{if } i \equiv 0 \pmod{3}. \end{cases}$$

Let $W_0 = (\mathcal{V}, \Sigma, \omega)$ be defined by $\mathcal{V} = \{0, 1\}$, $\Sigma = \text{powerset}(\mathcal{V})$, and $\omega = 1$, over all of $\mathcal{V}$. Observe that W_0 is the skeleton of Δ_0 . Let W_i be similarly obtained as the skeleton of Δ_i . Then $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}\xi + \mathbb{Z}, 1)$ is the unital ℓ -group generated in $\mathbb{R}$ by ξ , with 1 as the order-unit.

Final Remarks. Up to isomorphism, every stellar sequence $\mathcal{W}$ determines a unique AF C*-algebra $A = A_{\mathcal{W}}$ via the map

$$\mathcal{W} \mapsto \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W}) \mapsto K_0^{-1}(\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{W})),$$

where $K_0(A)$ is the unital dimension group of A , [11]. Combining Elliott classification [8, 11] with Theorem 5.1, we get that (up to isomorphism) the range of the map $\mathcal{W} \mapsto A_{\mathcal{W}}$ coincides with the class of unital AF C*-algebras A whose dimension group $K_0(A)$ is lattice-ordered and finitely generated. Various important AF C*-algebras existing in the literature belong to this class, including the Behnke-Leptin algebra with a two-point dual [2], (whose K_0 -group is as in Example (4) above) the Effros-Shen algebras [7] (whose K_0 -groups are those given in Example (5) above), and various algebras considered in [6], the universal AF C*-algebra $\mathfrak{M}_1$ of [15] (= the algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ of [4]) (whose K_0 -group is $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$). Theorem 6.1 provides a simple criterion to recognize when two stellar sequences $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}'$ determine isomorphic AF C*-algebras $A_{\mathcal{W}}$ and $A_{\mathcal{W}'}$. This criterion is a simplification of the equivalence criterion for Bratteli diagrams, [5, 2.7].

REFERENCES

- [1] J.W. Alexander, The combinatorial theory of complexes, *Annals of Mathematics*, 31:292-320, 1930.
- [2] H. Behnke, H. Leptin, C*-algebras with a two-point dual, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 10:330-335, 1972.

- [3] A. Bigard, K. Keimel, and S. Wolfenstein, *Groupes et Anneaux Réticulés*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, volume 608, 1971.
- [4] F. Boca, An AF algebra associated with the Farey tessellation, *Canad. J. Math.*, 60:975–1000, 2008.
- [5] O. Bratteli, Inductive limits of finite-dimensional C^* -algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 171:195–234, 1972.
- [6] R. Cignoli, G.A. Elliott, D. Mundici, Reconstructing C^* -algebras from their Murray von Neumann orders, *Advances in Mathematics*, 101:166–179, 1993.
- [7] E.G. Effros, C.L. Shen, Approximately finite C^* -algebras and continued fractions, *Indiana J. Math.*, 29:191–204, 1980.
- [8] G.A. Elliott, On the classification of inductive limits of sequences of semisimple finite-dimensional algebras, *J. Algebra*, 38:29–44, 1976.
- [9] G. Ewald, *Combinatorial convexity and algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
- [10] A.M.W. Glass, W.C. Holland, (Eds.) *Lattice-ordered groups*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.
- [11] K.R. Goodearl, *Notes on real and complex C^* -algebras*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Inc. Shiva Math. Series, 5, 1982.
- [12] P.M. Gruber, C.G. Lekkerkerker, *Geometry of numbers*, 2nd edition, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.
- [13] V. Marra, D. Mundici, The Lebesgue state of a unital abelian lattice-ordered group, *Journal of Group Theory*, 10:655–684, 2007.
- [14] D. Mundici, Interpretation of AF C^* -algebras in Łukasiewicz sentential calculus, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 65:15–63, 1986.
- [15] D. Mundici, Farey stellar subdivisions, ultrasimplicial groups, and K_0 of AF C^* -algebras, *Advances in Mathematics*, 68:23–39, 1988.
- [16] D. Mundici, The Haar theorem for lattice-ordered abelian groups with order-unit, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 21:537–549, 2008.
- [17] J.R. Stallings, *Lectures on Polyhedral Topology*, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, 1967.
- [18] J. Włodarczyk, Decompositions of birational toric maps in blow-ups and blow-downs. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 349:373–411, 1997.

(M. Busaniche) INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA DEL LITORAL- FIQ, CONICET-UNL, GUEMES 3450, S3000GLN-SANTA FE, ARGENTINA

E-mail address: manuelabusaniche@yahoo.com.ar

(L. Cabrer) CONICET, DEP. DE MATEMÁTICAS – FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS EXACTAS, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL CENTRO DE LA PROVINCIA DE BUENOS AIRES, PINTO 399 – TANDIL (7000), ARGENTINA

E-mail address: lcabrer@exa.unicen.edu.ar

(D. Mundici) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “ULISSE DINI”, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI FIRENZE, VIALE MORGAGNI 67/A, I-50134 FIRENZE, ITALY

E-mail address: mundici@math.unifi.it